

REPRINT OF PUBLISHED STATEMENTS
OF CERTAIN TRUSTEES OF THE UNI-
VERSITY OF LOUISVILLE CON-
CERNING CONDITIONS IN
THAT INSTITUTION.

Appeared in the Louisville Dailies
May 12, 14, 16, 18, 1928.

I.

The Resignation or Non-employment
of Certain Teachers.

Pages 2-6.

II.

The Recent Propaganda Against the Board.

Pages 6-11.

III.

The University's New Administrative
and Educational Policies.

Pages 11-19.

IV.

Why Mr. George Colvin is Retained
as President.

Pages 20-25.

TO THE CITIZENS OF LOUISVILLE:

You are familiar with the numerous attacks upon the Board of Trustees of the University of Louisville under the influence and direction of a small coterie of self-appointed guardians of the city's interests, and by several faculty members who have resigned or have not been reappointed for next year. Believing that replies to these would merely prolong an agitation which already greatly has injured the University, we were willing to subordinate our personal feelings and continue to ignore these attacks if that course were best for the University.

We have remained silent for more than a year, but have now come to the conclusion, in which we are supported by the judgment of numerous real friends of the University, that our silence is construed by many, who know nothing of the facts, as an admission of the truth of these charges, and hence that the interest of the University will be best served by a frank statement of these facts; accordingly we, the undersigned trustees, make this statement.

Neither space nor your patience will permit a detailed reference to all of them, but we shall consider them as briefly as possible. It will not be practicable, however, to publish this statement at one time, so it will appear in four installments.

The first will relate to the resignation of certain members of the teaching staff of the College of Liberal Arts—eight in number, out of forty-two—and the effect thereof on the welfare of the University.

The second will be a reply to certain propaganda put forth in an address to the recently organized Alumni Chapter of Citizens' Committee, an organization of about 50 out of the local alumni of about 1,500.

The third installment will relate to the new administrative and educational policies of the Board, which have been adopted pursuant to surveys and recommendations by Dr. Frank L. McVey, president of Kentucky University, covering administrative policies, and by Dr. R. J. Kelly, the leading American authority on courses of study.

The fourth will be a summary of the reasons why the Board, with a full knowledge of all the facts, retains Mr. Colvin as President.

We think it reasonable to ask every fair-minded citizen of Louisville to give the time necessary to read this complete statement.

I.

The Resignation or Non-employment of Certain Teachers.

Much importance has been given to the fact that in the College of Arts a number of present faculty, eight in all, will not return to the University next year owing to the controversy.

The University is made up of five different schools or colleges. The faculty at the present time consists of 215 men and women. Of these 173 (constituting the faculties of the School of Medicine, the School of Dentistry, the School of Law and the Speed Scientific School) have been reappointed for next year upon the recommendations of the various deans and heads of departments, being all of them, with the exception of Dr. Stuart Graves (who resigned from the School of Medicine to accept the deanship of the University of Alabama) and an associate professor who resigned from the Speed School.

Of the 42 members who make up the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts, 32 have been reappointed upon recommendations of the heads of the various departments. In order that there may be no caviling about the number, names and qualifications of these faculty members of the

College of Liberal Arts so reappointed, they are stated here, as follows:

Dr. John L. Patterson, Chancellor Emeritus, Professor and head of department of Ancient Languages.

Dr. M. A. Caldwell, Professor and head of department of Philosophy and Psychology.

Dr. A. R. Middleton, Professor and head of department of Biological Sciences.

Dr. A. W. Homberger, Professor and head of department of Chemistry.

Dr. E. B. Fowler, Professor and head of department of English.

Professor C. O. McMahon, head of department of Romance Languages.

Professor G. L. Spillman, head of department of German.

Professor Ralph E. Hill, head of department of Mathematics.

Dr. H. N. Sherwood, Professor of History.

Dr. J. Franklin Bradley, Associate Professor of English.

Mrs. Zelma K. Jenks, Associate Professor and head of department of Home Economics.

Andrew P. Dustin, Assistant Professor of Latin.

Dr. P. A. Davies, Assistant Professor of Biology.

Dr. Guy D. Stevenson, Assistant Professor of Mathematics.

Miss Onita Liter, Assistant Professor of Home Economics.

Dr. G. L. Corley, Assistant Professor of Chemistry.

Thomas King, Faculty Director of Physical Education.

Miss Louise Diecks, Instructor in Romance Languages.

Boyd Martin, Instructor in Dramatics and Director of the Playhouse.

Arnold Strode-Jackson, Instructor in Fine Arts.

Mrs. M. L. D. Hill, Instructor in English and Dean of Women.

Mrs. J. A. Mengel, Instructor in History.

Ernest Hassold, Assistant Professor of English.

H. E. Carswell, Assistant Professor in Chemistry.

Dr. C. P. Cambiaire, Assistant Professor of Romance Languages.

Dr. F. C. Edwards, Assistant Professor of German.

Dr. Douglas H. Corley, Assistant Professor of History.

H. H. Strandkov, Assistant Professor of History.

F. J. O'Brien, Lecturer in Sociology.

Arthur Taylor, Lecturer in Sociology.

Paul L. Benjamin, Lecturer in Sociology.

Mrs. Leah Zibart, Instructor in Recreation.

During the year there have been ten resignations from the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts, the same effective at the end of the current term. It may be remarked first, that this is not unusual, as the same number (ten) of the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts resigned or were not reappointed the last year of Mr. Ford's administration as President. Of this ten, the resignations of Mr. Douds* and Miss Blythe have no connection with the controversy, the former returning to his college for his degree and the latter getting married. The other eight are as follows:

Dean W. M. Anderson.

Dr. R. J. Kaufman.

Dr. R. S. Cotterill.

Mr. John P. Troxell.

Dr. Leo G. Raub.

Dr. K. J. Holz knecht.

Miss Sara Landau.

Miss Ethel duPont.

Of these, Dean Anderson was discontinued as Dean because he was out of accord and sympathy with the policies of the Board (as he admits in his published letter) so that we could not permit him to select the teachers for next year. Though fully conscious of this situation, he would not resign, so we were compelled to dismiss him as Dean—a very distasteful duty, as he is the personal friend of many of the Board.

Dr. R. J. Kaufman, a chemistry Professor, would have been retained but for an unfortunate personal difference between him and Dr. Homberger, the head of the Chemistry Department, who declined to recommend him for reappoint-

*Mr. Douds published a statement that this reference to him is an error. To correct it, he should be included with the eight named.

ment. He appealed to the Board, who tried the case and decided that Dr. Homberger was clearly entitled to be supported.

Dr. R. S. Cotterill has published his reasons for resigning. For personal reasons, as well as because of his hostility to our policies, he threw his whole soul into the fight to secure the dismissal of Mr. Colvin as President. He was irreconcilable, and took special pride in publicly showing his personal enmity toward the President. Later, at a Board meeting, he reiterated his hostility to Mr. Colvin in the latter's presence and in a manner that was most insulting. He boasts in his letter of resignation of having told us to our faces what he thought of our President. Knowing, as he of course did, that under these conditions his further connection with the University was of no value, common decency demanded that he should resign. This he failed to do, so we retained him in his position to avoid any possible claim that we violated our promise not to penalize any member of the faculty for what he said at the public hearing concerning the causes of unrest on the campus. Dr. Cotterill's resignation, to take effect at the end of this year, is a great relief to the Board. His usefulness to the University long ago was at an end.

The resignations of the others—John P. Troxell, K. J. Holzknecht, L. G. Raub, Miss Ethel duPont and Miss Sara Landau—have been previously published. They are all mere reflections of the position of Dean Anderson and Dr. Cotterill, but (with the exception of Miss Landau's) they obviously were written for newspaper publication as vehicles for denunciation of the Board.

You may rest assured that the University has suffered no loss by reason of these resignations. The frame of mind of these teachers toward Mr. Colvin and the Board, as evidenced by their letters, was such that their services, if they had remained, would have been wholly unsatisfactory.

Their places easily can be filled by others fully as competent and all but two positions already have been filled by equally competent appointees. Nevertheless, because this little group resigned, and because the Board dares refuse the demand that Mr. Colvin be discharged, numerous statements have appeared in the press seeking to inflame the public mind against the Board. Those conducting this renewed campaign, while posing as the friends of the University, are the ones who deliberately injured the Endowment Campaign for two million dollars by bringing on their agitation concurrently with it, when they just as well could have postponed their attacks until after the campaign was completed. Not content with that achievement, they now are trying to destroy the University itself by false and injurious statements as to present conditions.

The nature of these statements will be considered in the next installment.

II.

The Recent Propaganda Against the Board.

We wish to call definite attention to some statements which appeared in the *Courier-Journal's* issue of May 4, 1928, reporting an address to a small group of Alumni, who call themselves an Alumni Chapter of the Citizens' Committee. The avowed purpose of this organization is, by means of propaganda, to continue the attack upon the Board of Trustees. The speaker was Rabbi Joseph Rauch, one of Louisville's outstanding citizens. Rabbi Rauch was doubtless misled as to the facts, but because of the high esteem in which he is held by this community we feel we should reply definitely to his statements. A further reason for the Board's making this answer is the statement of the speaker: "In all our utterances so far there has been no denial of our statements." We shall

consider the declarations of Rabbi Rauch separately.

1. According to the report of this address, one of the first things said was that "the foundation of the University is *tottering because of its failure to attract students.*" This was accompanied by the further definite statement: "The school is *much smaller than it used to be.*" These declarations constituted not only a maladvertisement of the University, but, as stated above, they are not true.

The enrollment in the University of Louisville for the past five school years, including the summer terms, is as follows:

1923-24.....	1,230
1924-25.....	1,300
1925-26.....	1,295
1926-27.....	1,605
1927-28.....	1,700

The last two years were under Mr. Colvin's administration.

The enrollments in the College of Liberal Arts for the same period, including summer terms, were as follows:

1923-24.....	759
1924-25.....	850
1925-26.....	802
1926-27.....	1,085
1927-28.....	1,153

The distribution of the enrollment in the College of Liberal Arts for this period was as follows:

	Regular Term	Summer Term	Total
1923-24.....	551	208	759
1924-25.....	729	121	850
1925-26.....	802	No summer term	802
1926-27.....	903	182	1,085
1927-28.....	838	315	1,153

A more significant feature of the enrollment in the College of Liberal Arts for the past two years is this: Of its 903 students enrolled last year, not including summer term, 661 of them

were regular full-time students. Of its 838 students enrolled this year, not including summer term, 697 are regular full-time students. There were 242 part-time students in the College of Liberal Arts in 1926-27; there are 131 part-time students in the College of Liberal Arts this year. In other words, the total enrollment for this year exceeds that of any previous year in the history of the College of Liberal Arts. There were 36 more full-time students this year in the College of Liberal Arts than last year. There are 111 fewer part-time students in the College of Liberal Arts this year than last year.

2. Another statement in this address was that "*the best of the faculty are gone and the others are going.*" We, of course, cannot control any one's opinion as to who constitute the "best of the faculty"; but in justice to the large number of able professors remaining, as well as in justice to the University itself, we wish to express a very different opinion, and one which we submit is based upon a better knowledge of the facts. As to the remainder of the statement—the prophecy that "*the others are going*"—we can say nothing, since we can know nothing as to the future. But the existing fact is that out of 215 members of the teaching staff in the entire University, *all, except 13, have been reappointed for next year*, and we know of no contemplated resignations. According to experiences in most universities, this number of changes is exceptionally small.

3. The following unfounded statement also was made: "*Under present conditions at the University it is impossible to retain members of the faculty, and equally impossible to get men of equal caliber to take their places.*" We answer that we are experiencing absolutely no difficulty in securing others of equal caliber to take the places of those who are leaving. There have been more applications for positions in the University this year than at any other time in its history, there being more than one hundred applications for teaching positions in the College of Liberal

Arts. To fill the vacancies created by the ten departing members, sixty-three candidates have been considered. These candidates come from reputable institutions. In scholarship, in experience, in teaching ability, in reputation, those considered are fully equal to the ten resigning members. The positions already filled, leave at present only two vacancies.

4. This same speaker is further quoted as saying: "I have never known a school that has so openly sent out students to drum up trade." While this would not be reprehensible if true, it just happens that it is not true. This Board has done nothing of the sort, directly or indirectly, and we are informed by Mr. Colvin that neither he nor any one with his knowledge or consent has done so.

5. One other statement—a slander upon the several new professors who came to the University this year—is most surprising. It was: "I understand that strange things are happening in some of the courses in that there are *no longer any failures under the substitute professors.*" The clear and intended imputation here is that students who failed nevertheless were passed by these new professors—a grave charge that reflects seriously upon their honor.

The fact, however, is that the records for the first half of this year (the only ones available, as the second half is not yet completed) show that there were *seven* teachers under whom no students failed, and that *only one* of these was a new, or "substitute," teacher.

In connection with this subject of failures, we wish to note that the College of Liberal Arts has vastly improved in this respect under Mr. Colvin's administration during the last two years, even though the same dean had charge of the school. At page 12 of the report of Dr. Kelly, the educational expert, he presents a table showing for the year 1924-5 (which was the year before the appointment of Mr. Colvin) a startlingly large percentage of classes *in which there were*

no failures. In an introductory note to this table Dr. Kelly makes this statement:

“In Table VI is given the distribution of classes by departments according to the percentage of students who failed to do passing work. In this table the fact stands out that *98 classes out of a total of 180 gave passing marks to all the students.* This may, of course, mean one of two things: either unusually effective adaptation of the work to the students enrolled, *or a standard of work sufficiently low so that all students may satisfactorily complete the requirements.*”

His later remarks showed that he believed the latter was the true answer.

There is one charge, not here mentioned by Rabbi Rauch, but frequently made by others and commented on editorially in the press—that the Board broke their promise to the faculty that none should be penalized for what any said at the conference between the Board and the faculty when the latter were invited, if any so chose, to state their views as to the causes of unrest on the campus. This charge is wholly without foundation, and so far as we can learn no effort is made to support it except with the statement that the Board subsequently assigned some of the duties of Miss Kirwan, the registrar, to the officer of admissions, but this did not reduce Miss Kirwan's salary or the dignity of her position. This division of labor was on the recommendation of Registrar Gillis, of the University of Kentucky, after a study of our situation.

The Board last year re-employed every faculty member who was recommended by Dean Anderson. It scrupulously regarded its pledge, a striking illustration being its failure to discharge Dr. Cotterill lest it might be regarded as in violation of that promise. Happily the other members for the most part have co-operated and have properly and acceptably gone forward with their work.

6. In conclusion, we quote this further statement of Rabbi Rauch: "*The management knows that the University is on the decline.*" Exactly the contrary is true. Those who read the next installment of this statement, wherein is set forth the constructive plan of reorganizing the administrative and educational policies of the University, will see that it is on the road to higher standards, greater effectiveness, and broader usefulness than ever before.

III.

The University's New Administrative and Educational Policies.

The Board of Trustees of the University of Louisville refrained from taking action respecting changes in administrative and educational policies until the authorities upon these subjects whom it engaged for the purpose completed their studies of the Liberal Arts College and its needs in these respects. Now that the reports giving the results of those studies have been received, considered and adopted, it is in position to discuss constructive policies. Separate printed copies of these reports are available.

The University of Louisville now has a plan of university organization which will compare favorably with that of any in the United States. It has adopted for the College of Liberal Arts constructive educational policies which will mean higher standards, greater effectiveness and broader usefulness.

Upon taking stock at the beginning of Mr. Colvin's administration, nearly two years ago, the Board saw the need of certain changes in the administrative and educational policies of the College of Arts. For this the highest order of impartial and expert advice was necessary—and was ultimately obtained. The Endowment Campaign, however, coupled with the troubles on the campus, made the carrying out of this plan impossible the first year. Things quieted down

enough for it to be done this year. The Board proceeded with a full understanding of the grave obligations which responsibility for the collegiate training of Louisville's young people had placed upon it. With the execution of this plan also went the determination that nothing should be permitted to stand in the way of its meeting these obligations as fully, fairly and efficiently as was within its power.

Accordingly it invited Dr. Frank L. McVey, President of the University of Kentucky, to study and report upon our problems of organization; and Dr. J. F. Kelly, then Dean of Administration of the University of Minnesota, now President of the University of Idaho, to study the curriculum of the College of Arts and to make recommendations as to its future educational policies.

Dr. McVey is a nationally recognized authority upon university organization. Dr. Kelly was recommended by the General Education Board as one of the foremost authorities on educational methods, his book entitled "A Study of College Curricula" being regarded, the Board learn, as the classic on this subject.

After several months of study, in co-operation with a committee composed of certain members of the Board and all of the Deans of the various schools and colleges, President McVey suggested a plan of organization which was unanimously approved by the committee, with the exception of Dean Anderson. This reorganization was thereupon adopted by the Board of Trustees. Following the recognized plan of all leading universities, it gives to the University of Louisville a legislative body representing the faculties of all the schools and colleges. The University now can consider and formulate educational policies on a university basis; and by bringing the various schools and colleges into a closer and more harmonious relationship it can do more effective work and develop a more unified university policy and spirit.

It should be added that this reorganization recognizes to the fullest extent all the rights, duties and privileges of the faculty and provides for an indeterminate tenure of office. It thus upholds one of the main contentions of the faculty made at the time of last year's conference, that is, the one relating to the one-year written contract, which seemed necessary for the first year because of the numerous questions as to terms and conditions of employment which then arose. Mr. Colvin, however, contrary to what seemed to be the belief of the faculty at that time, was in nowise responsible for the one-year contract, but instead advised against it.

The report of Dr. Kelly upon the curriculum of the College of Arts was made after a careful study and conference with faculty members. It was afterwards approved by the faculty, with only one dissenting vote, and was adopted by the Board. We consider its criticisms and recommendations so important that we summarize them under separate headings.

1. There has been a failure to recognize that the University of Louisville is a part of the public school system of Louisville, and hence a failure to utilize the exceptional opportunity to do more effective college work by having the college course correlate, instead of largely duplicate, the last two years of High School work. Dr. Kelly discusses all of his recommendations fully, but we can only make a brief quotation.

In emphasizing the necessity of correlating the High School course with that of the college, Dr. Kelly says:

“The essential point is that the curriculum of the High School and the first two years of College should be viewed as a single unit, rather than viewed as two separate units. Particularly is this true in a municipal university where opportunities for co-operation between High Schools and a College are so abundant.”

2. There is an urgent need for a better understanding of the needs of the students and a

better adaptation of the curriculum to those needs. After pointing out that "the University of Louisville must seek to serve the needs of *Louisville's young people* in particular while recognizing that these young people have certain needs in common with all mankind," Dr. Kelly, in commenting on the large number of small classes, heretofore conducted in the University, objection to which by Mr. Colvin and the Board excited criticism, says:

"Here again it will be observed that there were in '24-'25 49 classes of from one to five students, 37 classes of from six to ten students, and 18 classes of from eleven to fifteen students. * * * Surely a college pressed for funds as the College of Arts is *cannot justify the maintenance of so many small classes* whether in the interest of undergraduate students alone or in the interest of both undergraduates and graduates. It appears that to multiply courses even to the extent which is practiced at present is a *costly matter*."

Dr. Kelly also called attention to the evident lack of the College of Liberal Arts' study of the individual needs of its students. Concerning the unfortunate results that have arisen from failure to do this, he said:

"But few institutions with which I am familiar could make such rare good use of personnel service as could the College of Arts of the University of Louisville. With a freshman class numbering last year 448, the sophomore class numbered 202. This means that less than 50 per cent as many students returned for sophomore work as came for freshman work. Since the freshman work is not regarded as an end in itself, except for students entering law and dentistry, the students who drop out without having finished at least two years of college can rarely avoid a feeling of disappointment and lack of proper adjustment between themselves and the college. Of course, there is a limited number of cases whose dropping out is unavoidable, but so large a drop as prevails in the College of Arts of the University of Louisville cannot but sug-

gest the urgent need of better understanding of the individual needs of students and a better adaptation of the work of college to those individuals."

3. The essential qualities in the selection of a faculty should be *teaching ability* and an enthusiastic interest in the *development of students*. The ends of education cannot be attained unless teachers *teach students rather than subjects*.

In speaking to this point he draws a clearly cut distinction between the educational policy of an undergraduate school and that of a graduate school. By undergraduate school, it will be understood, is meant the ordinary college, with the freshman, sophomore, junior and senior years. The graduate school is designed to give post-graduate work to men who have previously graduated.

Dr. Kelly approves the stand taken by the Board from the outset in favor of emphasizing in an undergraduate college teaching ability and character training. Of this he says:

"In the undergraduate college, the essential qualities called for are *teaching ability* and *enthusiastic interest in the development of the students*, accompanied, of course, with adequate scholarship to call out the best intellectual development of students. In the graduate school, the essential requirements of the teacher are a high degree of scholarship and an interest in the extension of the field of learning through both the endeavor of the teacher himself and of the students working under his direction. American education has already paid a high price for confusing these two types of characteristics in the faculty of departments of instruction which extend from the freshman college level through the graduate school."

It will be remembered that some of the faculty (who will not be with us next year) deny that it is the function of a college teacher to develop character, and severely criticised President Col-

vin for his insistence on this policy. We wish here to emphasize the importance of character education in an undergraduate school by quoting the following from Dr. Charles F. Thwing, the President Emeritus of Western Reserve University, President of Phi Beta Kappa and distinguished writer on higher education:

“The Undergraduate College is concerned primarily with the *training of character*. Its purpose is to *make men*. The Graduate School is concerned primarily with the *training of the intellect*. Its primary purpose is to *make teachers*. The Undergraduate College uses *personality* as its chief instrument or condition. The Graduate School uses *scholarship* as its chief tool. The Undergraduate College takes into view *primarily ethical conditions*, the Graduate School *intellectual conditions*. The Undergraduate College is concerned with enriching American life through sending forth into it each year *a body of noble men who are also trained thinkers*. The Graduate School is primarily concerned with *training leaders* who in their professional career, and especially in teaching, shall give to American society the highest intellectual and ethical results.”

4. With reference to the early criticisms of the Board for its alleged lowering of standards by its emphasis upon the need for undergraduate teaching rather than graduate, the conclusion of Dr. Kelly is interesting. He discusses the University of Louisville's relation to graduate work as follows:

“Until such time as the undergraduate College of Arts has met thoroughly effectively its obligations to Louisville, it is *inopportune to lay stress upon graduate work*. The resources of the city of Louisville will undoubtedly be strained for some time to supply adequate support for high-class training of its *undergraduate student body*. If there are those who believe that the development of graduate instruction does not involve either the sacrifice of undergraduate instruction or any considerable increase in cost, I may merely say that such persons either do not conceive of the same

distinction in purpose between undergraduate and graduate instruction as does the writer, or they cannot have ascertained the facts with reference to costs of graduate instruction where such is properly maintained."

We do not intend to abolish or discourage graduate work, but in line with Dr. Kelly's suggestions the full development of a graduate department will be a slow process, and it cannot take place until we have effectively met the needs of our undergraduate students and until we have the necessary financial support to insure proper teaching and adequate library and laboratory facilities.

It is fair to say that many members of the faculty, at the time, agreed to the views of the Board in respect to research work, when our true position, which was substantially as above indicated, was understood by them. Nevertheless, the announcement of this policy was the occasion for great clamor and much criticism. The foregoing discussion of graduate and research work applies only to the College of Arts. We fully recognize that research work is essential in the University's professional schools.

To deny the force of the foregoing fundamental considerations in the formation of a constructive educational policy for the College of Liberal Arts would be to ignore the far-reaching changes which are taking place in the organization of Liberal Arts Colleges in many universities. The failure of the Liberal Arts Colleges generally to meet effectively the present needs of students has been so apparent to thoughtful educators that many universities of recognized standing already have reorganized their Liberal Arts curricula or are actively considering plans to that end.

We already have progressed in our plans for making the Liberal Arts College a more effective and useful institution. An important step in this direction is the selection of a Dean who has administrative ability, expert training in edu-

cational methods and a thorough knowledge of the requirements of this new curriculum. We believe that we have such a man in S. M. Whinery, whom we have recently appointed Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

That the faculty of the Liberal Arts College is now impressed with the wisdom of these changes is evidenced by the fact that at a meeting of the faculty for the purpose of acting upon Dr. Kelly's report, it was overwhelmingly accepted. Dean Anderson left the room before the vote was taken, and Prof. Cotterill was the only one who voted against it. Already several of the departments have reorganized their curricula on the basis of these suggestions, and in other departments the same thing will be done.

It is the purpose of the Board, as soon as practicable, to put into the curriculum orientation courses in social sciences, biological sciences, philosophy, psychology and fine arts. It intends also to develop the courses in economics with a view to establishing ultimately a Department of Commerce and Business Administration which will not only meet the needs of students, but also will give valuable practical help to many business concerns in Louisville. Steps will also be taken more adequately to meet the needs of a great many of our students who are training for High School teaching.

We deny emphatically that these new policies and plans will mean any lowering of the standards of the University of Louisville. On the contrary, we are setting up newer and higher standards which will make the institution more effective and useful than it has ever been in the past.

It is unfortunate that this reorganization of the College of Liberal Arts has been accompanied by such violent opposition on the part of a small group of the faculty and their personal friends. It is true that at the beginning of Mr. Colvin's administration nearly the entire faculty, under a misconception of the facts, was stampeded;

but their inherent common sense prevailed and disruption was averted. One consolation in all this trouble is the reflection that nearly every other institution which has gone through this process of reorganization has met with the same problems that confronted us here; but, fortunately for them, they did not receive the kind of publicity which has been destructive, rather than constructive.

It is but fair to President Colvin to remind you that those educational policies which were advocated by him when he assumed the presidency of the University of Louisville, and which were so desperately assailed at the time, have been upheld by Dr. Kelly and have wide support among other educators.

The prospective developments in the College of Liberal Arts of the University of Louisville, we are confident, will bring about a closer co-operation with our high schools, a more careful study of the needs of the young people of Louisville and the adjustment of our curriculum to those needs, a proper emphasis upon teaching ability in our faculty, a genuine interest in students without any sacrifice to scholarship, a recognition of the importance of character-building in education and a gradual development in graduate work as funds and facilities become available. The carrying out of this conception of the possibilities and responsibilities of the Liberal Arts College will give us a useful institution of high standing which will be worthy of first place among the municipal universities of the United States. It is only upon this basis that we can continue to justify the expenditure of public money for the support of the University of Louisville. In this task we bespeak the sympathetic understanding and support of the people of Louisville.

In the next installment we shall discuss matters affecting Mr. Colvin's relations with the University.

IV.

Why Mr. George Colvin is Retained as President.

An attack upon a newly appointed college president is no novel nor unusual phenomenon in the history of American educational institutions. Shining examples are such men as Dr. Elliot, of Harvard, Woodrow Wilson, of Princeton, and Dr. Alderman, of the University of Virginia. In like manner, equally numerous in recent years have been instances of serious differences between the faculty on the one hand and the President and Trustees on the other, as in the Universities of Pennsylvania, Iowa, Wisconsin, Alabama, and others. As has been said, "Peace should be, but is not always, characteristic of university circles."

These conflicts usually have grown, in varying form, out of the opposition of conservative faculties to progressive educational policies. It seems, however, that in no case has this conflict brought about any permanent injury to the institution; on the contrary, it often has been helpful in keeping a proper balance, and it generally has resulted in the adoption of the progressive policies.

We refer to these facts to show that the differences between the faculty of the Liberal Arts College of the University of Louisville and the President and Trustees of the University are not unusual and are not necessarily a reflection either upon the educational policies of the President and his fitness for that office or upon the good faith and sincerity of the faculty.

It is fair, however, here to refer again to the fact which was elaborated in the third installment of this statement that the recommendations for the Liberal Arts College by Dr. J. F. Kelly, a leading authority upon this subject, embodied the very educational policies which were advo-

eated by Mr. Colvin and for which he was so vigorously assailed.

Those who still cling to the European theory of the higher training of the few for leadership will continue to differ from Mr. Colvin, Dr. Kelly and those who advocate the American view of training the masses for citizenship; but it does not alter the fact that the whole tendency of the development of the American Universities during the past decade or longer has been in the direction of the better adaptation of its work to the democratic American ideals. If many endowed universities and almost all State universities have felt the necessity of readjusting their program to meet present-day conditions, it is even more essential for a municipal university, such as the University of Louisville. Those, therefore, who have followed the trend of America's educational development and understand the struggle for democratizing our educational institutions will realize the nature of the conflict at our University and which would have arisen even though we had escaped the unfortunate personal antagonisms which complicated our situation.

With reference to Mr. Colvin's qualifications and general fitness for this position, his record at college shows something of the character and mentality of the man. He was graduated from Centre College with the A. B. degree at the age of nineteen. While a student at Centre he had an enviable record. He was president of his class for four years, a winner of the Barret Memorial Latin prize, president of the Deinologian Literary Society, member of the debating team, captain of baseball and football teams, and member of track team, and at graduation was valedictorian of his class. He was Superintendent of Public Instruction from 1920 to 1924. In this position he did more than any other superintendent in the last generation to lift the level of education in Kentucky. The legislative and administrative reforms, that came as a result of his

efforts, were recognized both within and without the State as a notable advancement. A graduate of one of Kentucky's most renowned educational institutions, an educator with long successful experience, an executive who for four years was in charge of the State's school system, and trained in college problems through his position as Trustee of Centre College and the University of Kentucky—Mr. Colvin seemed to this Board a well-qualified administrator to take charge of our University just as it was moving into its larger development and entering upon a campaign for an endowment.

He did not seek this position, but was sought out by the Board and persuaded to give up the excellent constructive work he was then doing as Superintendent of the Louisville & Jefferson County Children's Home.

He is able, honorable, industrious and devoted to his work. In his ardor to go forward with his constructive plans, he may have moved too rapidly; he may have failed properly to appreciate the conservatism of the faculty and to meet it with tact as consummate as it should have been. He probably was over-eager, too incisive in his procedure, and perhaps forgetful of certain traditions within the institution which it would have been well for a new executive to deal with more thoughtfully.

Nor does the Board claim to be free of blame in the same respect and we heretofore have so declared.

Granting, as we do, certain errors in method committed by Mr. Colvin and the Board, under the stress of unusual and difficult circumstances, the valuable lesson of which has not been lost upon him or us, we find in this history nothing to justify our discharging Mr. Colvin as President.

To have done so, when this controversy was young, might have brought the Board the peace of surrender and saved it labor and criticism, but neither our judgment nor our conscience

could justify the act. Nor have we since found any sufficient reason so to do.

We are not irrevocably committed to Mr. Colvin. He has not yet had a fair opportunity, though even under difficulties he has succeeded admirably with the four professional schools, and rapidly is improving conditions and re-establishing good-will and understanding in the College of Liberal Arts. If, after a fair opportunity under proper conditions, he should fail to meet adequately the requirements of his responsible position, we would take cognizance of that fact as quickly as any one, and our sense of duty to the University would cause us to bring the relationship to an end. While we are not anticipating that contingency, we will not shrink from it should it come.

Mr. Anderson in his communication of several days ago revived issues discussed in a report which the Committee of Association of College Professors published last October and criticises the Board for not answering that report in this statement. The reasons for not doing it are plain. In the first place, it is so voluminous that, to make a detailed reply to it, would take more space than this entire statement. In the next place, we assert, without intending to reflect upon the committee, that its report was not a judicial determination of anything. A group of professors came here at the instance of another group of professors, members of the same organization, to consider the latter's grievances. The Board of Trustees were not consulted, some of its members never even learning until after the event that they were here. And finally, the real issues largely discussed in that report relate to matters all of which, except certain **merely personal** issues, have been settled by the studies of Dr. McVey and Dr. Kelly.

The principal items, other than those personal to Mr. Colvin and the faculty, in the report of these professors were: (1) the Dr. Gottschalk episode, and they were far from justifying him;

(2) the one-year contract, for which the Board, and not Mr. Colvin, was responsible and instead of which we now have the indeterminate tenure of office as embodied in the McVey report; (3) the relative merits of graduate and undergraduate work in the Liberal Arts College, which were fully discussed in our third installment and with which stand of the Board the Committee did not disagree; and (4) certain administrative mistakes of the Board in dealing with the situation, which we are confident will be corrected by our new rules on organization.

But we are not apportioning blame. We have never been without appreciation of the circumstances that alarmed and excited the members of the faculty when Mr. Colvin became President. We have not underestimated the services and good-will to the University of the faculty as a whole. We have tried, patiently, to bring reassurance to earnest men and women who in some respects have been disturbed without substantial basis for their anxiety, and whose objections in other matters have been met.

In this long and painful controversy, so prolific of misconception of purposes and so needlessly bitter and personal, we have earnestly endeavored not to permit personal considerations to affect our actions or the presentation of our views. We shall continue to maintain this attitude for the double reason that no good cause is well served by severe words or personal charges and that we are public officials.

We have no one to punish or reward. We have hoped and still desire to make friends and supporters of the University, of those who hitherto have not understood or have disagreed. We have not closed and will not close the door to helpful criticism or suggestion. We shall continue to seek and to follow expert advice on the problems of the University as they arise. We are Trustees of a great trust without pride of power. Where we have erred in judgment we have been

and are ever willing to undo mistakes when we become aware of them.

For the benefit of those who are interested in the University, we are glad to assure you, despite the clamor of those who will not have peace, that gradually the spirit of understanding is growing, and with this better understanding and clearer conception of our purposes and program, there is sure to come that internal unity of purpose which will insure the realization of the high ideals that we all have for the University. The University must be first in our thoughts. Its destinies are more important than the personal victory or defeat of any man or set of men.

Respectfully submitted,

YANCEY ALTSHELER,
JOHN W. BARR, JR.,
HARRY A. DAVIDSON,
E. S. JOUETT,
FRED W. KEISKER,
J. C. MURPHY,
ALFRED SELLIGMAN,
WILLIAM S. SPEED.

I was absent from the city when the publication of the foregoing statements began and for that reason did not sign them. Since then I have read and carefully considered them and fully concur therein.

ERNEST S. CLARKE.

Mr. J. S. Laurent, the remaining trustee, is not in sympathy with the other members of the Board.